

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed March 6, 2009, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this application, each of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action has been carefully considered and is addressed below. The claims as presented are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-11, 13-24 and 26-31 were previously pending in this application. No claims are amended, added or canceled. As a result, claims 1-11, 13-24 and 26-31 remain pending for examination, with claim 1, 13 and 23 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Each of independent claims 1, 13 and 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,578,046 to Chang et al. ("Chang") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0216498 to Georgalas et al. ("Georgalas"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A. Claims 1-11 and 13-24

Each of independent claims 1 and 13 includes limitations directed to an enterprise component corresponding to a data store component and comprising a data store object component corresponding to at least one data store object stored in each of a plurality of data stores. A data store object source code generator is configured to generate object-oriented programming language source code for each data store object component of an object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface.

In the "Response to Arguments" section, the Office Action contends that Chang satisfies the limitations of claims 1 and 13 directed to a data store object source code generator configured to generate object-oriented programming language source code for each data store object component of an object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface. The Office Action relies

upon passages of Chang at col. 20, line 58-col. 21, line 56 and col. 22, lines 25-67 as support for this contention. This contention is unsupported by the reference.

In the cited passages, Chang discloses a federated query object 19 (FIG. 2) which provides the capability to execute a combination of queries, such as parametric queries or on-demand queries, across heterogeneous data stores (col. 20, lines 60-63). However, Chang says nothing about federated query object 19 being configured to generate object-oriented programming language source code for a data store object component of each of a plurality of data stores, as required by each of claims 1 and 13. Rather, Chang discloses that federated query object 19 delegates the creation of programming language source code to individual data stores (col. 20, lines 64-67). Specifically, Chang discloses that each individual data store takes input from federated query object 19, and translates the input into queries for execution on the respective data store, executes the queries, and then provides the results to federated query object 19 for consolidation (col. 20, line 66-col. 21, line 3). The system of Chang thus does not include a data store object source code generator configured to generate object-oriented programming language source code for a data store object component of each of a plurality of data stores, as required by each of independent claims 1 and 13. Rather, in the system of Chang, each data store creates its own query code based on input from federated query object 19.

Georgalas fails to remedy this deficiency of Chang, as Georgalas says nothing about a data store object source code generator configured to generate object-oriented programming language source code for each data store object component of an object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface, as required by each of claims 1 and 13.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1 and 13 patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references, such that the rejection of these claims, and of the claims that depend respectively therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Chang in view of Georgalas should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 23-24 and 26-31

Independent claim 23 includes limitations directed to a data store object source code generator capable of generating object-oriented programming source code for a data store object component of each of a plurality of data stores, wherein the data store object source code generator generates object-oriented programming language source code for each data stored object component corresponding to the extensible mark up language (XML) data store object definition generated from a graphical representation.

It should be appreciated from the discussion above with reference to independent claims 1 and 13 that neither Chang nor Georgalas discloses or suggests a data store object source code generator capable of generating object-oriented programming language source code for each data store object component of an object-oriented heterogeneous data store interface. Chang and Georgalas thus necessarily fail to disclose or suggest a data store object source code generator which generates object-oriented programming language source code for each data store object component corresponding to the extensible mark up language (XML) data store object definition generated from a graphical representation.

Accordingly, claim 23 patentably distinguishes over any combination of the asserted references, such that the rejection of claim 23, and of each claim that depends therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious over Chang in view of Georgalas should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith to our Deposit Account No. 23/2825, under Docket No. M1103.70561US00.

Dated: 6-8-09

Respectfully submitted,

By Randy J. Pritzker
Randy J. Pritzker
Registration No.: 35,986
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
617.646.8000